



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/650,134 | 08/29/2000 | Ronald Hage | C4007(C) | 9257 |

201 7590 06/07/2002

UNILEVER
PATENT DEPARTMENT
45 RIVER ROAD
EDGEWATER, NJ 07020

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1751

18

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

94

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/650,134 | | HAGE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | | Art Unit | |
| | Gregory R. Del Cotto | | 1751 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-14, 16, 18-20, 22-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3, 15 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>17</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/9/02 has been entered.

Objections/Rejections Withdrawn

2. The following objections/rejections as set forth in Paper #12 have been withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 1-16 and 18-24 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 909809 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 2, 4-14, 16, 18-20, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 97/38074, WO 95/34628 or WO 97/48787 for the reasons of record set forth in Paper #12.

R sponse to Arguments

Art Unit: 1751

With respect to '628, Applicant states that the molecular oxygen as taught by '628 is not the same as atmospheric oxygen as recited by the instant claims and that were the reference to have meant atmospheric oxygen it would have simply stated that the catalyst would need no peroxide generating system at all. In response, note that, the Examiner still sees no distinction between the molecular oxygen and atmospheric oxygen as recited by the instant claims. The oxygen in the air is the same as molecular oxygen. Furthermore, the bleaching effect of the catalyst by using air is dependent upon the particular type of catalyst chosen and not the oxygen itself. The fact that the catalyst bleaches when exposed to air is a property which is inherent to the particular type of catalyst chosen. Regardless of whether oxygen is from the air or called molecular oxygen which may be sourced from the air or another source, the oxygen is the same. Furthermore, Applicant states that the bleaching system containing aldehydes as disclosed by WO 97/38074 is the same as the molecular oxygen as suggested by '628 or '787. In response, note that, while the publications have the same assignee, there is no disclosure in either '628 or '787 of the use or necessity of an aldehyde.

Additionally, even though '074 teaches the use of aldehydes, the instant claims do **not exclude** the use of aldehydes but only state that the complex catalyzes the bleaching of a substrate by atmospheric oxygen without the use of aldehydes. Thus, since '074 teaches the same bleach catalysts as recited by the instant claims, the Examiner asserts that these catalysts would have the same bleaching properties

Art Unit: 1751

without the use of aldehydes as recited by the instant claims, even though '074 may recognize the fact that aldehydes enhance such a bleaching effect.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims³_A 15 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

None of the references of record, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a bleaching composition or method of bleaching wherein at least 50% of the bleaching is accomplished through atmospheric oxygen using the specific bleach catalyst as recited by the instant claims.

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (703) 308-2519. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

Art Unit: 1751

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra Gupta can be reached on (703) 308-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

GRD
June 6, 2002

GREGORY DELCOTTO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G. Delcotto', written over the printed name of the primary examiner.